India

FOR THE

No. 44. New Series.]
No. 138. Old Series.]
WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1898.
[Registered as a Newspaper.
{Price...... 2d.
{By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 241
Lord Curzon's Confession of Faith 244
The London Indian Society 245
The Khyber Pass Arrangements, by Colonel H. B. Hanna 246
Chronicle of the Week 246
Letter to the Editor: Mr. Romesh Dutt on the Calcutta Municipal Bill 247
London Indian Society: Annual Dinner 247
Lord Curzon on India 249
The Khyber "Settlement" 250
India in the British Press: The "Press Committees"... 251
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 251
Advertisements 252

NOTES AND NEWS.

We learn from a trustworthy source that among those present at the public meeting in Westminster Town Hall on October 26 (reported in last week's India) was a shorthand reporter commissioned to take a *verbatim* note of every speech. This report, we are informed, was required not for publication but for "official use." If this means, as we have reason to believe that it does mean, that the India Office desired to read every word of what was said, the British Committee of the Indian National Congress will no doubt be glad to find that its meeting aroused so much interest, and will hope that Lord George Hamilton may read, mark and inwardly digest all the speeches. There is, however, a more sinister side to this exhibition of official curiosity. Under the new law of sedition, as Mr. Chambers pointed out, an Indian who delivers a speech in England may be prosecuted on his return to India if the authorities regard any of his expressions as disaffected. As our readers are aware, the speeches delivered at Westminster were distinctly moderate—perhaps too moderate—in tone. But as disaffection in India now means "absence of affection," and as an Indian is liable to imprisonment for saying anything which may bring the Government into contempt, it is obvious that any language other than that of effusive adulation may lead to a conviction. Mr. Bonnerjee, we may add, left London for Marseilles on Wednesday last, *en route* for Calcutta. Does the India Office hope to institute proceedings against him? We must wait and see. Lord George Hamilton, as recent experience has shown, is capable of a good deal. Why should he shrink from a scandal and an outrage which would undoubtedly have the effect of ensuring the repeal of his own iniquitous legislation? We commend the matter to the vigilant notice of the Westminster Liberal Association, and similar associations throughout the country.

The Indian National Congress is getting on. A correspondent informs us that at the recent competitive examination for posts in the Indian Civil Service, one of the questions put to candidates (not in the *viva*, but in the written examination) was substantially as follows:—"What are the avowed aims of the Indian National Congress? Are any of them feasible?" We are informed further that at least one Indian candidate who discussed this question in a sense highly favourable to the Congress obtained a place in the list. "The incident," our correspondent writes, "shows that notwithstanding the sneers that are levelled at the Congress as consisting of a 'microscopic minority' of the Indian people, its reputation for good has penetrated into high places." That is quite true. But has anybody ever believed the contrary? When an institution is thought worthy to be sneered at vigorously for fourteen years, its importance, we think, may be said to be established by that mere fact.

In the latest number of the *Bengalee* that has come to hand further particulars of Mr. Ambler's case are given, which throw a new light on some points. If we refer to the case again, it is with no desire to retry it in these columns, but rather because the points which arise have a certain general interest. It appears that Mr. Ambler was acquitted under both the sections 304 and 325 of the Indian Penal Code; that he pleaded guilty to a common assault under section 352, but was acquitted of this also by the jury; and that the counsel for the defence, being afraid lest the judge should under these circumstances remit the case to the High Courts, persuaded the too friendly jury to convict his client under section 358. The *Bengalee* makes the following objections: (1) The prisoner being accused under section 304 of an offence punishable by penal servitude for life, should have been committed to the High Court (Criminal Procedure Code, section 447, clause 2); (2) he should have been tried by a mixed jury (Criminal Procedure Code, section 450, clause 1), but the three persons who composed the jury were all Europeans; (3) they were all three members of a club to which Ambler belonged, one being its secretary; (4) the judge in sentencing the prisoner to a fine of Rs. 10 and one day's imprisonment told him he need not be kept in confinement, but could sit in court till the court rose, when of course, as would have been the case in England, he was free. Finally, the judge called upon the station-master and two other witnesses for the prosecution to show cause why they should not be prosecuted for perjury. Probably the next time an Indian dies soon after being assaulted by a European the judge will not have to give even one day's imprisonment.

The *Tribune* speaks excellently on the misrepresentations to which Indians are subjected as a consequence of the growing ignorance of the people which the rulers of the country display. Quick transit has brought Anglo-Indians nearer to England and nearer to each other. The educated Indian does not show that extreme deference which marked his predecessor, and is in some respects the rival of the European. And so the public at home is the more easily deceived, and the officials in India are more ready for panic and repression. In India, as elsewhere, it is those that know the people best who have the best opinion of them.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes: "The *Chateau en Espagne* which evolved itself in the eloquent speech of the Viceroy-designate, amidst his fellow Etonians, was fair to see. Its phrases of good intentions served as pleasing pavement for the fascinating temple of hope, with its domes of consolidating duty and pinnacles of high aspirations, which this promising orator built up before the mind's eye of his appreciative audience. In Lord Curzon's finely worded estimate of the qualities required—not to fulfil, for, as Lord Rosebery indicated, that is impossible, but—to cope with the duties of the highest post that any subject of the Queen can occupy," there is not a sentence to invite objection. That appreciation may well stand in its literary form as the ideal of what a Governor-General of India should always have in sight, though it may not be reached. The evident sincerity and earnestness of the speaker carried conviction with his words. And yet in almost the only instance when he touched the earth of solid fact there came a jar, a strange mixture which fills one with misgiving, and reveals the really narrow standpoint from which Lord Curzon surveys recent Indian history on its practical side.

"It was thus the ominous misconception emerged. His lordship, speaking of 'those immediate Etonian predecessors of my own,' said that 'Lord Lansdowne left India amid greater manifestation of popularity, regret, and esteem than any departing Viceroy since the Mutiny.' Now it is really difficult to understand how even Lord Curzon should have made such an astounding mistake. But it reminds us of what from other sources has long been known, namely, that the Hon. Mr. Curzon did not

begin his 'study of the Indian question' until quite late in the eighties—that is, he plunged into the subject on that rising tide of reaction on the revolutionary policy which has not yet run its course. But even allowing for Lord Curzon's very modern and as yet superficial knowledge of internal Indian affairs, it is amazing that he should have uttered such an extraordinary travesty of recent history as is comprised in the passage quoted above. It is true that the Marquis of Lansdowne had a complimentary farewell banquet given in his honour at Calcutta by the Services and a few of the European merchants in that city. But that class and partisan demonstration was organised mainly as a set-off to the *un*popularity and *dis*esteem which, from every centre of independent public opinion, was surging around the departing Viceroy. The grudging and formal laudatory address from the Corporation of that city was only got up by the special exertions of its official members, aided by the 'society' influences which were moved for the purpose, after that body had evinced an intention to refrain from the usual compliment. As indicated in the pages of INDIA at the time (see February, 1894), the estimate of Lord Lansdowne's Viceroyalty was the very reverse of that so vainly imagined by Lord Curzon. The *Statesman* and other impartial journals of the period abound in such expressions as these — 'Lord Lansdowne's whole career as Viceroy has been illiberal and reactionary . . . these things and things like them make out Lord Lansdowne's Viceroyalty as a period of reactionary incompetence. He has left his successor a legacy of confusion, disorder, and something very like bankruptcy.' At that adulatory banquet the noble marquis showed that he felt and resented those censures of which his fellow Etonian is utterly ignorant; and, as INDIA justly remarked thereon—'In the calmer reflection of six months' hence Lord Lansdowne may, perhaps, regret the language which he thought fit to use and his farewell speech at Calcutta.'

"Lord Curzon seems to be quite unaware of the touting demi-official circular by means of which by far the larger portion of the subscription for the Lansdowne statue was drawn from the 'protected' princes and chiefs of India—including Kashmir, the virtual confiscation of which kingdom remains an indelible blot on the Cross-Lansdowne *régime*. It might be painful, but would be eminently salutary if the Viceroy designate could peruse the record of the really magnificent send-off which the Marquis of Ripon received at Bombay, to whom was indeed accorded that unexampled testimony of 'popularity, regret and esteem' which Lord Curzon, under strange misconception, has applied to his friend Lord Lansdowne. There is one very grave reflection induced by this little incident. It indicates to those few who do know and follow Indian affairs all round, to what a very large extent the official classes here and conventional journalists keep shut off in compartments such knowledge of those affairs as they care for, regardless of the wide field without. And in Lord Curzon's case this unconscious blunder as to fact shows that he is going out to India—in blinkers. When and how he may be able to shake off these partisan and official blinkers is very doubtful; but until he can do that his noble aspirations and good intentions will be of no avail for India's welfare."

It is a considerable time since Dr. Barry on behalf of the Plague Committee made a series of allegations against the Poona Municipality. The Government, as the *Mahratta* points out, were in a difficult position. From the result we can see that they were not satisfied of the justice of the charges, and yet it was against their policy to do anything which could diminish the prestige of the Plague Committee. But at length, when the matter had been almost forgotten, they have virtually given a verdict of acquittal, declaring that they "are by no means disposed to attach blame to the Municipality for all the serious defects disclosed by those papers." The Municipality of Poona are now discussing various sanitary reforms, but as the Government have to admit, financial difficulties, here as elsewhere, are in the way.

With reference to this matter an Indian correspondent writes:—"Your readers have heard something from time to time of the long controversy which has taken place about the Poona Municipality. As soon as Dr. Barry made violent and reckless charges against the municipality last year, the opponents of self-government in India took up the subject in this country vigorously, and there was a long leader in the *Times* on the incompetence of the people of India to manage their own affairs. Since then the hollowness of Dr. Barry's charges has been exposed. It has been shown that the endeavours of the municipality to improve the drainage had been delayed through the fault of Government officials; and now after the expiry of a twelvemonth from the date when the charges were formulated the Government virtually exculpate the municipality. The Government in their G.R., No. 5086 G.D., dated September 12, 1898, acquit the municipality of all blame in the matter of the allegations made against it by Dr. Barry. The Government proceed to make the significant admission that they 'are by no means disposed to attach blame to the municipality for all the serious defects disclosed by those papers.' Fair journalism would require that the decision now arrived at by the Government should be published by those English papers which made so much capital last year of Dr. Barry's charges. But fair journalism in regard to Indian matters is as yet unknown in this country. There is a conspiracy to publish and exaggerate all that tells against the people of India; there is a conspiracy also to hush up all that proves their fitness for self-government." But surely our correspondent does not assert this of all English newspapers?

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* draws a contrast between the treatment of the so-called Ghatal rioters who had an opportunity to engage counsel and were acquitted, and that of the Garshankar rioters who were tried so secretly that the affair would never have been known if it had not been for the energy of the *Tribune*. The *Patrika* speaks thus of the deputy magistrate who tried the Ghatal case: "As for Mr. Mackertich, he has made his name a household word in the district of Midnapur, nay, outside it, for the moral courage and high sense of justice he showed in deciding the case against the prosecution, which was for all practical purposes conducted by the Government." It is said that Mr. Mackertich was transferred to the revenue branch two days after he passed judgment.

We take the following from the *Tribune* of Lahore (October 8):—

In an appreciative article, for which we are grateful, that appeared in INDIA on the 9th ultimo, demanding an enquiry into the Garshankar riot, two questions have been put towards the end to which definite answers may be given. The questions are—"Is it true that when the rioters were before the magistrate 'they were absolutely undefended—no lawyer appeared on their behalf, no witnesses were called and none appeared?' Is it true that, as appears from the evidence of the principal witness for the prosecution, 'at first the inhabitants were most anxious and eager to co-operate with the authorities in keeping the town clear and taking every precaution against infection,' that 'up to the very last the attitude of the people was not defiant or aggressive, but respectful,' and that 'they were always ready to lay their grievances before the authorities'?" Both these questions we reply emphatically in the affirmative as we have done before. The record of the trial shows that the accused were undefended, the Magistrate in his judgment gives no reason why no witnesses were called for the defence, or why the accused were not defended by counsel. He admits that the whole town was in strong sympathy with the accused, but he makes no reference to the utter absence of even an attempt at defence. We have given in detail the experiences of a pleader who went to Garshankar from Hoshiarpur to attempt to defend the accused and how he had to return without being able to see the Magistrate. As regards the next question the evidence of the Tahsildar is sufficiently explicit. He stated on oath and on his own motion:—

"Accordingly the Deputy Commissioner and Dr. Dutta ordered that Garshankar be thoroughly cleaned, the clothes of every household in the city be washed. The people themselves were very anxious to keep out the disease, so everyone carried out the order. On the next day I and Doctor Sahib inspected every house in the town and found it clean. . . . The interest of these people in the sanitary arrangements and in the restrictions was keen. Even if a seer of grain came from outside they used to take it with the permission of the Tahsil. Even persons coming to sell fuel were not allowed by them to enter the town. They themselves had come to see the need of restriction."

It has never been any part of our case to make doubtful statements or assertions without sufficient warrant. We hold evidence of every single statement made and have proved to the hilt all that we have written. It is on such facts as these that we have been demanding an enquiry.

Those who read the Anglo-Indian papers are aware how ready these journals are to pose as the special guardians

of the morality and good conduct of the Press, and to point out the faults of their Indian contemporaries. The *Times of India*, supported by the consciousness of its own virtue, has had occasion to blame the Indian Press for commenting on cases in the Law Courts while still *sub judice*. It is, therefore, with a pardonable exultation that these papers see the *Times of India* guilty of the same offence. Mr. Sealy, an advocate, accused the *Times of India* of publishing a garbled report of an unfinished case, and Mr. Spenser, the magistrate, agreed with him and asked him, according to the *Mahratta*, "to write to the Editor of the *Times of India* saying that the matter was put before the Magistrate, who expressed his entire disapprobation of the conduct of that paper." Is it too much to hope that the *Times of India* will adopt a more moderate tone for the future when it chastises the misdeeds of the Indian Press?

The *Hindu*, of Madras, in its review of the report of the Board of Revenue on the Land Revenue Administration of Madras, brings out some remarkable facts. The total area taken up for cultivation was about 22 million acres, but out of this over 4 million acres were left waste by the cultivators. Mr. Rogers, formerly of the Bombay Civil Service, has drawn attention year after year to the harsh methods of assessment in Madras, which compel cultivators to leave land waste, and the fact that nearly one-fifth of the land was left waste in 1896-97 proves Mr. Rogers's contention. But this is not all. Out of the 4,306,779 acres of land left waste, the Government assessed the full revenue on 3,651,576 acres, or nearly three-fourths of the cultivated area, and granted remissions only on the remaining 655,203 acres. So that even by leaving the land waste the cultivators did not free themselves from the grinding taxation on land.

The second noticeable fact is the positive increase in the land assessment as a whole even in a year of distress and famine. The Government mills grind slowly but grind small. The steady increase of land assessment in India year after year, in spite of the increasing poverty and indebtedness of the cultivators, is one of the most lamentable results of British rule in India. Mr. Romesh Dutt was strictly within the mark when he said that there have been six great famines in India within the sixty years of her Majesty's reign, that these famines have carried off ten or twelve millions of her Majesty's subjects, and that the grinding land administration systems of India are responsible, not for creating these famines, but for intensifying their effects. The total assessment of the holdings in Madras in 1896-97 was over 433 lakhs, which was nearly 7 lakhs more than the assessment of the previous year. Needless to add, large remissions had to be made during the year.

Another remarkable fact is that while the number of holdings, large and small, in the Province in 1896-97 was 3,376,729, the number of coercive processes issued was 5,816,226. In other words, the Government had to issue on an average about two coercive processes for every cultivator before the rent could be realised. What an awful state of things this fact discloses. But the truth seems to be still worse. Many rent collectors, according to the *Hindu*, issue one single demand for all the rayats in a village, thereby enabling the Government to count as one a hundred or more processes which may have been issued in the same village. Many village rent-collectors, it is alleged, are directed to send out orders of distraint and attachment at the beginning of each month, or in default are required to pay down the amount fixed for the month on pain of dismissal. One is not surprised to learn that under this system property was attached in 230,487 cases, and that 21,467 acres of land were sold for recovery of arrears.

Land is assessed in Madras on the principle that the Government is entitled to one half the net produce—that is of the produce of the soil after deduction of the cost of collection. This is an extremely heavy demand. As Mr. Rogers has often pointed out, the Bombay system of fixing assessments on the basis of actual realisations in previous years is infinitely more considerate. But it must not be supposed that the cultivator in Madras is left to enjoy the other half of the net produce after Government has taken its half. Water-rate land cess and village cess, charge for boundary marks, besides process service fees, interest and penalties have also to be borne. The system is harsh and grinding. It practically disables the cultivators in good years from saving anything for bad years; and it necessarily brings on famines after bad harvests.

The land administration in the Central Provinces of India seems to have been even worse than that of Madras, if one may judge from the wretchedness and indebtedness of the cultivators. Official apologies are idle in face of the fact that in most of the districts in India outside the permanently settled tracts the cultivator is impoverished, indebted, and always on the brink of starvation. The Central Provinces Tenancy Bill seeks to help the cultivator. But the provision to retract the right of transfer hitherto enjoyed by the Malguzar and the cultivator would be a step in the wrong direction. The Hon. Mr. Chitnavis says:—

> I consider it my duty to point out that the provisions which restrict the right of transfer will, in regard to mulguzars, and, in a less degree, in regard to tenants, be very objectionable to many members of the classes interested. The right of transfer has been regarded, especially by the malguzars, as one of the most valuable and honourable incidents of property.

It is by reducing the demands of the State, not by confiscating the right of sale, that the condition of the cultivator of the Central Provinces can be improved.

Malarial fever has returned to Lower Bengal with the autumn, and we gather from the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* that it is causing terrible havoc: "In many places, in a family of five, perhaps all the five have got it, and there is no healthy member to fetch water or tend the sick." It is much the same story year after year. Every year after the rains the whole nation is struck down by fever, thousands are carried off, millions are prostrated. Yet we have not heard of any serious contribution made by the Government to improve the drainage and relieve the condition of the people. Money will be found for the new policy laid down for the Khyber Pass, for the new militia, new forts and roads, and perhaps a new railway. But he will be a true statesman and benefactor who will turn for a moment from these precautions against an impossible invasion to relieve the people of India by moderating the land assessments and improving the drainage and the supply of drinking water.

The agitation against the Calcutta Municipal Bill is growing in volume and intensity. Rájá Benoy Krishna, president of the public meeting recently held in Calcutta, has appealed for funds, and his Committee are assured that whatever sum is required will be collected. A memorial largely signed by the ratepayers of Calcutta will, it is understood, be submitted to the Government. It is said that Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea may come as a delegate to England, with a view to action in Parliament, or, failing him, Mr. Kali Charan Banerjea. The utmost alarm and indignation have naturally been excited by a Bill virtually abolishing the rights of self-government, which have been enjoyed and wisely exercised by the people of Calcutta for twenty-two years.

If the whole matter were not so serious and lamentable, the way in which the Government of Bombay is slowly climbing down from the position it took up in relation to the Natu brothers would be ludicrous. Instead of candidly admitting a blunder, the Government is receding by degrees. The last order, it seems, is that the Natus are free to go out of Belgaum town into other parts of the Belgaum District, but must not go beyond the district. The *Mahratta* writes: "Government must certainly be congratulated upon the way in which they are reclaiming inch by inch the land from those terrible sedition-mongers the Natus, whose crimes are so terrible that the Government cannot even *name* them."

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Sir Louis Addin Kershaw, Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature for the North-Western Provinces, to be Chief Justice of the High Court in Bombay, in succession to the late Sir Charles Farran.

LORD CURZON'S CONFESSION OF FAITH.

It would be a cold and unsympathetic nature that could remain untouched by the strong feeling which Lord Curzon displayed when, surrounded by his old friends and schoolfellows at the Etonian dinner last Friday, he spoke out the faith that was in him, and, like a knight of old at the altar, made promise of his devotion to the great duties that lay before him. There was a generous enthusiasm in his words which will pass far beyond the circle of his hearers in England and arouse echoes and hopes in the distant land where his action for good or evil will mean so much. Beyond that band of old Etonians, who honoured him for carrying on the great traditions of the school, beyond the friends and companions of his youth, were the two hundred millions of Indians with whom for a time his name was to be indissolubly associated, to whom he was coming in the flower of his manhood, and who were eagerly drinking in his words to see what counsels of hope and confidence they might gain from him who was so soon to be the supreme ruler of their country. And in the eloquent speech of Lord Curzon there were not wanting signs of sincerity and good-will which all who love India and long for her prosperity will welcome and hope to see fulfilled.

Nevertheless, some small omens of evil were not wanting. Lord Rosebery paid the future Viceroy a doubtful compliment when he spoke of Lord Curzon's "qualities of eloquence, of debating power, and of argument"; for eloquence and debating power are of little use to the holders of that high office. Nor could the chairman's hope that India under Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty would be saved from war, pestilence and famine fail to remind the people of that country how under British rule famine, which is not a result of dearth, but of poverty which can make no provision against dearth, has become a constantly recurring calamity, and how the wars from which India has lately suffered were not sent by vengeful gods, but were a result of the acts of men—of Viceroys and their advisers. Lord Curzon said that he might have many things to unlearn. Let us hope that the very first thing he will unlearn will be his belief in that policy of extending the frontier which, in spite of all his great qualifications for his new post, has filled the mind of India with fear. Let us hope that the peace which is so vitally necessary to the material well-being of India—to put it on the lowest ground—will throughout his Viceroyalty have no firmer guardian than Lord Curzon of Kedleston.

The Viceroy designate is naturally—we might almost say, as becomes one in his position—a great admirer of the system of which he will soon be the head. He tells us that it is the duty of the Viceroy to represent the conviction that the justice of the Queen's "government is inflexible, that its honour is stainless, and that its mercy is in proportion to its strength." Let us hope that under his rule all these good things may become true. But to suppose that they are true already, and that what is needed is not improvement or reform, but only the maintaining of a position already won, is to be blind to many of the salient events of the last two years. Is the justice of the Queen's rule inflexible when we see outrages by Europeans on Indians unpunished, or punished, in the inferior courts at least, so much less severely than those of Indians on members of the ruling race? Is the honour of her rule stainless when we find a Secretary of State bringing various and inconsistent charges against the Natus, which he will neither prove nor withdraw, and to which they have had no opportunity of reply? Is the mercy of her rule in proportion to its strength when we consider the prosecution and imprisonment of Mr. Tilak? Is not the imprisonment of men without trial, without knowledge of the charges made or the evidence on which those charges rested, and without opportunity of defending themselves or clearing their characters, a scandal which renders ridiculous all these high claims for English government in India? Is not this resurrection at the end of the nineteenth century of the methods of the Bastille and the Inquisition inconsistent with such words as justice, honour and mercy?

But if Lord Curzon exaggerated the present virtues of British rule, he uttered some excellent precepts as to the future government of India. The Viceroy is to try to remember, he said, "that it is only by regard for" the people's "feelings, by respect for their prejudices—I will even go so far as to say by deference to their scruples—that we can obtain the acquiescence as well as the submission of the governed." If only all Viceroys and all persons in authority had acted up to this in the past, how much misery and suffering might have been saved! That these words should have been used by a Viceroy constitutes one of the greatest victories of Indian public opinion. What but a few months ago was a sign of disloyalty and sedition has now become a truism of government, expounded by successful Lieutenant-Governors and eminent Judges, and now receiving the seal and confirmation of the future chief Governor of India. We hope Lord Curzon will remember that this view of the duties of the rulers of India was only accepted when the failure of an opposite policy had forced it upon them, while it was always advocated by the leaders of Indian opinion; for if he remembers this he will be less ready to scout the advice of the people of the country and to think that all wisdom lies with the Anglo-Indian officials, unfortunately growing more and more out of touch with the thoughts and feelings of those whom they have to rule.

Further, Lord Curzon insisted that "we endeavour to administer the government of that country in the interests of the governed." It may be so, but it is doubtful if the endeavours are quite successful. A system in which the finances of India have to pay the whole cost of wars beyond the frontier, in which one of the poorest civilised countries has to support the most expensive administration in the world, and in which there is an enormous drain of wealth, counted every year by millions, to satisfy the obligations of the Indian Government in London, appears to consult the interests of the governed in a curious way. Lord Curzon says that "we think much of the welfare of India and but little of its wealth"; where the wealth is so small there is but little reason for thinking much of it. Great or small, we managed to carry away Rx. 35,000,000 of it in the course of a single year by means of the excess of exports over imports. Among the things Lord Curzon would do well to unlearn is this extravagant belief in the perfect virtue of English government in India.

To two institutions, the Roman Empire and the East India Company, the new Viceroy hardly did justice in his brilliant speech. He told his hearers how he had been taught at Eton to admire the great work of Imperial Rome, and how this had laid the foundation of his pride in the British Empire of India. Now, to put aside all questions of the different periods in man's history in which these two empires have flourished, and of the far greater preponderance of military interests in the earlier, where all the greatest statesmen were great soldiers also and industry was so much less developed—to put aside all this, one striking difference must force itself upon even the most superficial observer. In the Roman Empire the men of the conquered nations not only could and did hold the highest posts in their native provinces, they even reached the highest offices of Rome itself, and as emperors ruled the Roman world. To mention but one instance out of many, the great Trajan, one of the best of the emperors, was a Spaniard, and retained to the end of his life the provincial accent of Spain. But not an Indian has yet reached any of the highest posts in India. How the proposal would be scouted were it suggested that one of them should occupy the seat Lord Curzon is about to fill! And what chance is there of an Indian ever becoming Prime Minister of England? The two systems, whatever their superficial resemblances, are as far apart as the ages and civilisations in which they arose.

Nor is the Viceroy designate altogether just to the East India Company. Granted that in the worst ages of that institution its high officials administered the country with shameless rapacity, yet the drain of wealth from India was less than it is now. The peculations of a few individuals cost less than it does to support the honest but extravagantly expensive government under which the Indians now live. Nor must it be forgotten that the malpractices of the Company were exposed by some of the greatest men of those times, malpractices which the Government had no reason to defend, while now that there is a Secretary of State for India in the English Cabinet the abuses of its government are defended by ministers and ex-ministers alike, and reform is checked by a conspiracy of silence. We are very far from saying that the former system is better than the present, but at least the balance of evil is not entirely on one side.

But after all is said and every qualification made it may yet be allowable to feel some hope in the new Viceroy's

enthusiasm for India and all things Indian. The country has suffered much from weak rulers. Lord Curzon has a reputation for strength. If he governs in the interest not of a few Anglo-Indians, but of the whole community, if he sees with his own eyes and not with those of bigoted officials, much will be forgiven him, and he may leave a name which will be remembered in India long after the Viceroys to whom he referred so admiringly have been forgotten.

THE LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

"ENGLAND! with all thy faults I love thee still!" Such was the evident feeling of the London Indian Society as exhibited at its annual dinner at the Holborn Restaurant on Tuesday evening. Even the speakers who brought the heaviest indictments against England, or rather against misguided instruments of the policy of England, instead of being irreconcilable, looked earnestly for signs of a more discriminating and sympathetic government. It is an excellent feature of these meetings that the business is not kept by any means exclusively in the hands of the elders. The younger men find opportunities of taking part in the political as well as in the social function, and learn to flesh their swords discreetly under the kindly applause or the kindly satire of their lively fellows. No part of the proceedings is more charming than the loyal allegiance of one and all to the headship of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, their social chief and political father—unless, indeed, it be the paternal interest and even solicitude of Mr. Dadabhai for his young compatriots. The Society brings together at one board, and joins in one political sense, the most diverse representatives of Indian life—representatives of all Indian races, classes, and creeds. When a youth comes over from India to study here, it matters nothing whether he hails from Peshawar or Malabar, from Karachi or Calcutta, whether he is a Hindu, a Mahometan, a Sikh, a Parsi, or whatever else, whether he is a student of law, of medicine, of agriculture, of engineering, or whatever else, he finds at once a warm welcome in the London Indian Society. Not only is he thus placed at his ease in a foreign land, and initiated into the peculiarities of a new and strange environment, but his political interest is sharpened, moulded, and matured. It would not be easy to over-rate the utility of the influences that are thus continuously brought to bear on Indian youths during the three or four years of their sojourn here for purposes of study. The greatest point of all is that they come to understand, in some degree at least, the English character as distinguished from the Anglo-Indian character, and therein find a fresh and perhaps unsuspected element of hope for the future of their country. It is rather irksome for us to undertake the dubious task of proffering good advice to lusty youth, but one was glad to listen to the impressive words of Mr. W. A. Chambers, who wisely insisted that every word and act of an Indian in England had its influence not only here but also in India, some six thousand miles away.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the President, had not uttered three sentences from the chair before he had begun to mark with emphasis the distinction between the manifest and sincere intentions of the Queen-Empress and of the people of England on the one hand, and on the other hand the perversion of these intentions by the officers with whom lies the duty of carrying them into practical effect. Like all educated Indians Mr. Dadabhai holds by the great Proclamation of 1858 as the sheet anchor of his hopes and expectations for his countrymen. The great aspiration towards the prosperity and contentment of our Indian fellow-subjects remains yet unfulfilled. It seems, indeed, to many of us to be even farther from fulfilment than it was in 1858. As Dr. Murison pointed out, it is impossible to think of India in these days without calling up visions of war, famine, and plague, with all their disastrous consequences balefully running on during the intervals of cessation of the active scourge. Mainly, if India is ever to be led into the paths of prosperity and contentment, these mischiefs must be effectively combated. In these pages we have done our best to demonstrate the essential factitiousness of the recent wars beyond the North-West frontier. Only last week we indicated plainly that the ruinous policy of the past fifteen years, temporarily cloaked under the eyes of the House of Commons, is again in full activity in the Khyber Pass, where the Government of India have just sown seeds that will yet grow to bitter fruit—bitter, not to the Government, but the governed. So long as the Government is practically irresponsible, it can be as perverse as it pleases in its contempt for the most obvious and expensive lessons of history. It is the pious and facile fashion to attribute famine, plague, and earthquake to the uncontrollable and inscrutable dispensation of higher powers. We certainly have no pills to offer as good for earthquakes; but it seems as plain as possible that famine can be checked, nay, can be absolutely prevented, by such a course of internal administration as shall leave in the coffers of the rayats the means of provision against the day of scarcity, and that the basis of plague can be readily removed and its attacks mitigated by a frank understanding with the leaders of Indian opinion.

It is on this point, indeed, that the whole case turns. The unhappy tendency of recent years has been, as Sir William Wedderburn has again and again emphasised, to drive a deep chasm between the rulers and ruled, so that the rulers lose touch with the people. Various speakers at the Indian Society's meeting laid just stress on this fatal development. Sir John Kaye, writing nearly half a century ago, remarked that "it is difficult, above all things, to acquire that comprehensive knowledge of the feelings and opinions of the Indian people which alone can enable us to adapt our legislation to their moral and physical requirements." He pointed out that "the great evil of English legislation" was that it was "based upon an imperfect knowledge of the wants and wishes of the people"; and went on to show how much more difficult it necessarily was for strangers in a strange land to know the people sufficiently well to legislate for them with wise intelligence. The difficulty remains just as serious as it ever was. Yet now our governing class in India has gradually cut off from itself the obvious means whereby they could have any chance of obtaining the information essential to the rational conduct of the administration. The social gap between Indian and Anglo-Indian has been rendered unbridgeable and all but impassable; the Indian journalists have been muzzled, or pressure has been put upon them to print foolish flatteries in place of honest criticism. The sole means now remaining for the frank declaration of Indian opinion are two: the voices of Indian members of the Legislative Councils, and the proceedings of the Indian National Congress. By a curious coincidence it fell to Lord Curzon to recommend to the House of Commons the principle of interpellation introduced, as a consequence of the urgency of the Congress, into the Indian Councils Act (1862) Amendment Act of 1892; and he urged its importance on the very ground of getting at popular opinion. The position of Indian members, however, requires to be improved; and in spite of Anglo-Indian murmurs against their very presence in Council, it is necessary now to give them the fullest rights of initiation as well as of interpellation and of criticism. We shall still have to wait for the day desiderated by Dr. Murison when a strong-headed and strong-hearted Secretary of State or Governor-General will frankly take counsel with the President of the Congress. But that day is bound to come, and then the Congress will be fused in a truly national Government.

Notwithstanding the gloomy outlook of Mr. A. O. Hume, whose name will ever be nobly associated with the origin and progress of the Congress—a gloominess due no doubt in the main to his regrettable illness—most of the speakers adopted a tone of chastened hopefulness. The future rests primarily of course with the Indians themselves—on their activity, their clear-sightedness, their moderation, and their earnestness; and secondarily, yet essentially also, on the interest of the people here. There can be no doubt that a fresh gain has been made in this country. Dr. Murison pointed to the enlarged interest of some of the daily and weekly journals of large influence. Mr. Chambers was able to confirm the inferences from the increased attention of the newspapers to Indian affairs, and reported from his own experience of the past few weeks that the people in all parts of the country heard him gladly and promised to forward the cause as opportunity offered. For ourselves, we believe firmly that the Front Benches can be controlled into wiser action within a reasonable space of time, only by the direct impulse of the English electors. The war must therefore be carried steadily into the con-

stituencies. If the electors could have looked on at the proceedings after dinner on Tuesday evening, they would have learned a striking lesson from the London Indian Society. They would have seen the indisputable indications of unquestioning loyalty, a hopeful anticipation of the ultimate redemption of the magnanimous pledges of 1858, and a fervid aspiration after a truly national and satisfying government, in which Indians should play their natural part in cordial co-operation with Englishmen.

THE KHYBER PASS ARRANGEMENTS.

By Colonel H. B. Hanna.

The arrangements for the management and protection of the Khyber just formulated by the Indian Government are a fresh proof of the strength of the military influences by which that body has so long been swayed, and of the little weight which it attaches to civil public opinion, British or Native, official or non-official.

That opinion, as reflected in the Press, has declared itself almost unanimously against any settlement of this question on forward policy lines, yet the terms now imposed upon the Afridis are marked by every fault which has ever been laid to the charge of the said policy.

1. They will ensure the permanent disaffection of the Afridis by depriving them of the control of a portion of their territory and by keeping the precarious nature of the independence still left to them ever before their eyes.

2. They will add to the distrust with which all the Pathan tribes have come to regard us.

3. They will prepare the way for a conflict with Afghanistan by deepening the anxiety and displeasure with which the Amír views the agreement to which in an evil hour Sir Mortimer Durand persuaded him to consent, and by placing a militia, which is henceforward to rank as an integral part of the Indian army, in contact with tribes recognising, indeed, the Amír's authority, but in reality little less lawless than their independent neighbours.

4. They will create new lines of communication flanked by secret foes.

5. They will multiply fortifications which, in the event of serious troubles in India, would probably have to be abandoned, and from which, if Lord Roberts's contention that Peshawar itself can be cut off, or turned, be correct,[1] we certainly must withdraw whenever the danger against which they are to be called into existence actually occurs.

6. They will facilitate the approach of the enemy we profess to dread by providing him with a good road through the Khyber, and at the same time they hold out the prospect of a further weakening of our own position beyond that Pass by the building of a railway, which will be to the full as subject to interruptions as the line which so often fails to connect Quetta with Sibi.

7. They will increase the number of untrustworthy troops in the Indian army—soldiers who instead of fighting our battles in the only wars in which their services are likely to be wanted, will require to be kept out of the way until peace has been restored.

8. They will add indefinitely to India's military burdens; for fortifications and mountain railways are capable of swallowing up all the money which a government can be induced to throw into them, and no one can pretend to estimate the cost of the war with Afghanistan and the tribes, which must be their final outcome.

The old Khyber arrangements proved satisfactory so long as the Afridis had no cause to suspect us of designs upon their independence, and there can be only two reasons for disturbing them, viz., the determination to inflict a permanent humiliation on that tribe as a punishment for its recent hostility towards us; or the intention of availing ourselves of what may seem a favourable opportunity for taking a step forward on the road to Kabul. If the former has inspired Lord Elgin and his advisers, they require to be told that, in the dealings of a strong State with a weak one, magnanimity is better policy than severity, and if they have been actuated by this latter, they need to be reminded that the interests of India demand the curtailment, not the extension of her area of responsibilities.

[1] "For these reasons I recorded a strong opinion in opposition to the proposals of the Defence Committee, which were in favour of the construction of a large magazine at Peshawar and extensive entrenched works at the mouth of the Khyber. I pointed out the extreme danger of a position communication with which could be cut off, and which could be more or less easily turned, for it was clear to me that until we had succeeded in inducing the border tribes to be on friendly terms with us, and to believe that their interests were identical with ours, the Peshawar valley would become untenable should any general disturbance take place; and that, instead of entrenchments close to the Khyber Pass, we required a position upon which the garrisons of Peshawar and Nowshera could fall back and await the arrival of reinforcements" (see "Forty-one Years in India," page 406, par. 1).

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, October 27.—A Cabinet Council was held at the Foreign Office.

The Sirdar arrived at Dover on board the Channel steamer "Empress" shortly before 3 o'clock this afternoon. The Admiralty Pier was crowded with people who had assembled to witness his landing. An address of welcome was presented at the Lord Warden Hotel, to which the Sirdar briefly responded. He was subsequently entertained to luncheon at the hotel by the Mayor of Dover. In response to the toast of his health, Sir H. Kitchener thanked those present for the magnificent reception accorded to him, which he regretted could not be shared by the army he represented. It was due to the endurance and courage of those troops that the difficulties he had had to contend with had been overcome. The Sirdar shortly afterwards left by special train for London, and on his arrival at Victoria had a most enthusiastic reception from immense crowds who had assembled inside and outside the station.

Sir E. Grey, speaking at Huddersfield, observed that with regard to the question that had arisen in the Nile Valley the national feeling was twofold—regret that the trouble should have arisen, and a determination not to recede. He entirely approved of the policy the Government had pursued with regard to the matter and he believed the country did so too. France had gone out of her way to do the very thing we deprecated. The rights of Egypt, the necessities of Egypt, and our obligations made it imperative for the Government to maintain its present position, and in no way to recede therefrom.

Sir C. Dilke, speaking at Salford, said that in regard to the question of the Upper Nile, peace was endangered by the Government having culpably allowed matters to drift into their present state. It now looked as though Lord Salisbury was ready to discuss French claims to a portion of the Bahr-el-Ghazal. "Graceful concession" with regard to fertile parts of mid-Africa in order to retain the swamp of Fashoda was inconsistent with Sir E. Grey's declaration.

The Criminal Chamber of the French Court of Cassation sat to hear the report of M. Bard, the Judge appointed for the purpose, on the Dreyfus case. M. Bard at great length discussed the various documents and facts in the case, and his report was still unfinished when the Court adjourned. A Reuter despatch said that late this evening President Faure sent for M. Charles Dupuy, and asked him to form a Cabinet. M. Dupuy deferred his answer till to-morrow.

The Egyptian War Minister demanded a first credit of £350,000 for the reorganisation of the Sudan.

Friday, October 28.—Lord Rosebery presided at a banquet given by Old Etonians at the Café Monico to Lord Minto, Governor-General-Designate of Canada, Lord Curzon of Kedleston, Viceroy-Designate of India, and the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, Bishop-Designate of Calcutta. Lord Curzon's speech is reported on another page.

Sir E. Grey, M.P., speaking at York, said we all hoped that the difference with France with regard to the occupation of the Nile Valley might have a peaceful solution. But it must be borne in mind that the trouble was not of the making of the present or any British Government.

The news reached both London and Paris from Cairo that Major Marchand had arrived at Khartum, having come there from Fashoda in order to bring the remainder of his report, which was not finished when Captain Baratier started to Cairo. He had left Captain Germain in charge at Fashoda. His departure from that place was not regarded in Cairo as implying a settlement of the question.

It was announced that Sir H. Kitchener, on his elevation to the peerage, will take the title of Lord Kitchener of Khartum and of Aspall, in the county of Suffolk.

M. Dupuy, after receiving promises of support from several leading politicians, undertook the formation of a Cabinet. It was understood that M. de Freycinet had been invited to take the Ministry of War, but had asked for time to consider the proposal.—The Court of Cassation sat again to consider the question of the revision of the Dreyfus case. M. Bard concluded his report, insisting on the necessity for a further judicial enquiry in order to bring the truth to light.

Saturday, October 29.—In the Court of Cassation in Paris, M. Mornard concluded his speech in support of Mme. Dreyfus's demand for revision. After more than four hours' deliberation, the Court pronounced its judgment, declaring the application admissible in form, and ordering a supplementary investigation, which it would itself undertake, but adding that there was no ground for deciding at present

on the application of the Procureur-Général for a suspension of the punishment.—Major Esterhazy was expelled from the Legion of Honour.

From Paris it was stated that Major Marchand would await in Cairo the instructions of the French Government which were being transmitted to him by Captain Baratier, who left Paris for the purpose to-night.

Five more Mahometans were hanged at Candia for participation in the attack on the British occupying force. Ismail Pasha, the Turkish Governor at Canea, said he had not received orders from the Porte for the withdrawal of the remaining Turkish troops, of whom there were still 2,500 in the island; and there were at present no Turkish transports at Suda. The Admirals notified Ismail that after November 4th, the Turkish administration would cease throughout the island, and they also asked him to inform them when he could evacuate the fortresses.

The German Imperial party visited various sacred and otherwise notable sites and places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem and were present at the dedication service of the new Evangelical Church of the Holy Redeemer.

MONDAY, October 31.—M. Dupuy completed his Cabinet, in which he himself, in addition to the Premiership, took the Ministry of the Interior, M. Delcassé that of Foreign Affairs, M. Peytral that of Finance, M. de Freycinet that of War, and M. Lockroy that of Marine.

It was stated that at to-day's sitting of the Peace Commission in Paris the American Commissioners handed in a demand for the complete cession of the whole Philippine archipelago to the United States. The Spanish Commissioners were greatly surprised at the demand, but confined themselves to their usual procedure of taking note of it and asking for an adjournment in order to consider it.

The German Imperial party continued to visit the places of interest in and about Jerusalem, where they had decided to stay for some days longer than was originally intended. To-day the Emperor and Empress were present at the solemn consecration of the Evangelical Church of the Holy Redeemer in Jerusalem. The ceremony was said to be very impressive.

TUESDAY, November 1.—The municipal elections took place throughout England and Wales. The returns received up to midnight indicated that the Conservatives had gained 57 seats —23 of them in Bolton, where there had been an extension of the borough boundaries—the Liberal Unionists two, the Liberals 39, the Independents eight, the Labour party ten, and the Socialists one.

From Canea it was reported that if the remainder of the Turkish garrisons in Crete were not withdrawn by Friday the Admirals had decided to remove them forcibly. A plan of provisional administration had been prepared pending the appointment of a Governor. The Porte had addressed to the four Powers a Note claiming the maintenance of a small Turkish garrison in Crete, the payment of an annual tribute, the administration of the law in the Sultan's name, and the right of pardon and the right of investiture of the Governor as prerogatives of the Sultan.

The text was published in Berlin of the address delivered by the Emperor William at the dedication of the Church of the Holy Redeemer in Jerusalem on Monday, and of telegrams addressed by his Majesty to the Pope and to the Grand Duke of Baden in reference to his acquisition of a piece of land in Jerusalem for the German Catholics.

WEDNESDAY, November 2.—In the Bankruptcy Court the public examination of Mr. E. T. Hooley was resumed. After giving details as to a deal in Humber Company's shares and the promotion of the United Ordnance and Engineering Company, in regard to which he said a commission note for £20,000 was given to Sir W. Marriott for the introduction of Mr. McCalmont and Sir Weetman Pearson, the debtor said the next company with which he was concerned was the Petersen Cycle Company. The share capital was £250,000, and there was no issue to the public. He sold some shares, but was obliged to buy back under threats, many of which the market price had fallen to *nil*. Sir Blundell Maple, one of the purchasers, said he would give him an hour to pay back £10,000, or would take means to obtain his expulsion from the Carlton Club. He paid Sir B. Maple the money. He was elected a member of the Carlton Club, having paid Sir W. Marriott £1,000 for the purpose in March, 1897, and he gave two cheques for £5,000 towards the party funds. He had paid £1,000 to Mr. Frank Harris, of the *Saturday Review*, to settle a matter with a Mr. Blake, who had been threatening to blackmail him.

Dr. Sarat Mullick has been promoted to the post of Assistant Physician, and Registrar and Medical Officer to the Electrical Department in the Hospital for Heart and Paralysis, Soho Square.

A fund of Rs. 6,000 has been offered to the Bombay University, and accepted, for founding a prize in the name of the late Mr. N. M. Paramanand. The interest of the money is to be given annually as a prize for the best essay, in Gujerathi or Marathi, on Indian Social Reforms. Failing that, it is to be spent on the encouragement of study for women, or for "unmarried male candidates" at the University.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

MR. ROMESH DUTT ON THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

SIR,—I regret to find that my speech at Westminster Town Hall on October 26, on the Calcutta Municipal Bill, has been so condensed by your reporter as to convey to the reader an incorrect idea of the Bill. Permit me therefore to correct a possible misapprehension of the scope and object of the Bill.

According to your reporter, I "protested against the intention to substitute for the present elective body, a dozen nominated and paid Commissioners who had no real or personal interest in the management of local affairs." This is not a correct account of the intention of the Bill, or of what I said about the Bill. What I said, as far as I remember my words, was this. After dwelling at some length on the good work of the present Municipal Commissioners, I said:—

What is the reward of this zealous and patriotic work done by the elected and nominated Commissioners during the last twenty-two years? What is the reward of the noble endeavours which they have recently made to save the city from the horrors of a plague? You would naturally think that a just, generous, a sympathetic Government would under these circumstances extend the rights and privileges of the people, and so enlist on behalf of the Government a still greater share of that willing co-operation which the people have manifested in the past in this administrative work. But no. A Bill has now been introduced in the Bengal Council which seeks to take away all real executive power from the hands of the elected and nominated Commissioners, and to vest them in a foreign body of twelve men, only one-third of whom will be elected by the Corporation. The men who have done so well in the past, who are permanent residents of the city, who have their homes and their families and children in the city, and who naturally take the greatest pride and interest in its improvement, are to be deprived of real powers, and these powers are to be transferred to a foreign body, only one-third of whom will be elected by the Corporation. And will this foreign body take any interest in their work? I find from some papers received from India by the last mail that a provision has been made to secure their interest in municipal work by promising them a fee of Rs. 32 for every committee meeting which they may attend. This is like depriving the County Council of London of its municipal powers and vesting those powers, not in parishes as the present Tory Government proposes to do, but in some of Mr. Hooley's paid directors, induced by the payment of fees to grace meetings. And seriously speaking, it seems to me preposterous to deprive the citizens of Calcutta, who have improved the town, who live permanently in the town, and who are interested in the welfare of the town, of the real work of municipal administration, and to transfer it to a foreign body of twelve men who have to be bribed with fees in order to take an interest in the work.

You will observe from the above that I did not protest against the intention "to substitute for the present elective body a dozen nominated and paid Commissioners." What I protested against was the intention to transfer from the hands of the elected and nominated Commissioners all real executive power into the hands of a foreign body of twelve men, only one-third of whom will be elected by the Corporation, and all of whom are promised fees to attend meetings. It is of the utmost importance to bear this distinction in mind; if we fail to do so, we shall be charged with misrepresentation.

Yours, etc.,

October 31, 1898. ROMESH DUTT.

THE LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

ANNUAL DINNER.

[FROM OUR OWN REPORTER.]

The annual dinner of the London Indian Society was held in the Queen's Salon of the Holborn Restaurant, London, on the evening of Tuesday, the 1st inst. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji presided, and there was a large company including Mr. Pickersgill, M.P., Professor Murison, LL.D., Mr. W. A. Chambers (*Bombay Champion*), Mr. Martin Wood, Mr. Gordon Hewart, Dr. Sarat Chandra Mullick, Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., Mr. H. S. Khalil, Mr. Ramchandra Vasudea Paranjpe, Mr. Ghose, and Mr. Mohun Lal J. Vakil.

In proposing "The Empress and the Royal Family," the CHAIRMAN said: This is a toast always acceptable to us. We know how sympathetic the Queen is, and how anxious she is for our welfare. But while giving expression to our sentiments of pleasure and of attachment to her Majesty, we cannot but remember that, unfortunately, there is another side of the question. We shall never forget that at the close of the Royal Proclamation of 1858, the Queen uses these words in regard to her Indian subjects: "In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward." But, unfortunately, while we are aware of the Queen's earnest desire for our welfare, her Ministers seem to interpret these words in exactly the opposite light to that in which we view them. They seem by their acts to believe not that in our prosperity will be found their best strength, but that it will be discovered in our poverty; they appear to look to our discontent for their security, and to our exasperation for their reward—("Shame")—and while Her Majesty in the same proclamation prays that those in authority may have power "to carry out these our wishes for the good of our

people," her Ministers seem to think that only through the misery of the people can our welfare be ensured. We cannot, therefore, help expressing our regret that this should be so, while at the same time we acknowledge our attachment and loyalty to the Queen, and give voice to our gratitude for her sympathy. But we believe still that the British people have a conscience. We look to them for justice. (Hear, hear.) We do not lose faith in them, and I hope the time will come, although I may not have the good fortune to live to see it, when all these things will be changed and her Majesty's best wishes realised. (Loud cheers.)

Letters of apology and regret were read from Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. Bonnerjee (who stated that he was leaving for Bombay the next day), Mr. C. E. Schwann, M.P., Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P. (whose name was received with loud cheers), Mr. Hume, Mr. Herbert Roberts, M.P., Mr. C. P. Scott, M.P. (editor of the *Manchester Guardian*), and the editors of the *Daily News*, the *Daily Chronicle*, the *Star*, and the *Morning Leader*.

"India and the Indian National Congress" was the next toast. It was submitted by Professor Murison, who concurred in the President's regret at the lack of those prime essentials of good government in India—the prosperity and contentment of the people. Nowadays it was almost impossible to think of India except in connexion with wars, famines, plague, and even earthquake, and the general spirit of discontent which was the worst of all. The country would long feel the effects of the successive wars which had been undertaken—whether wisely or not he would not stay to enquire—while the plague unhappily was still threateningly active. One result of it had been to produce on the part of their rulers a repression of public feeling not only unworthy of a free country, but never before paralleled in the history of India. If they were to look at India in a hopeful sense they must do so in connexion with the Indian National Congress—it seemed impossible to do so in any other connexion. The Congress was an inevitable fact; it became inevitable in 1793, when the Government realised that it was no longer simply a trader but was also a great territorial potentate. The principle of education of the Indians was admitted in the Charter of 1813, although nothing effective was done until the issue of Lord William Bentinck's Minute of 1835. From that time Indians took to learning, and applied the lessons they learned to all the problems of life and government. Fifty years later the Indian National Congress was established, and Sir Richard Garth thus described it:—"The Indian National Congress is a large, influential, and important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen, who, since 1885, have at the close of each year met at one or other of the large centres in India, such as Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, to discuss their political views and opinions." Now there had been, and still were, different opinions as to the character and value of this assembly. Only last year, the *Times* was not ashamed to speak of it as "the *so-called* Indian National Congress"; yet it was safe to say that several millions of men took direct part in the open election of delegates, fairly representing every rank, profession, and religion. He ventured to assert that the elections to the Congress were as free, as pure, and as representative as the elections to the House of Commons. (Hear.) He declined even to scorn the egregiously foolish as well as base assertions of other London papers that the Congress "is an essentially silly business," "a combination of babu vanity and intrigue with English twaddle," and so forth. He looked to the very different utterances of men of acknowledged position and of competent information. Sir W. Hunter was not regarded as a feather-headed man, even by the *Times*, and yet he had declared his belief that the general programme of the Congress would actually reach accomplishment by the end of the century. And a few years ago Sir Richard Garth, a good Conservative and a man of clear intelligence, replying to Sir George Chesney, spoke in energetic and emphatic terms of the utility of the Congress and its promoters. He said: "I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government in order to lend a helping hand to those poor people. They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses which have disgraced our Indian rule for years past; which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stay that fearful amount of extravagance which has been going on in India for years past, and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest counsellors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy. That is what these good men have done to deserve the taunts and insults of the member for Oxford city, and the relentless persecution of the Government of India." It did seem a strange thing that Indian officialism should persecute the Congress, and it was stranger still that English journalists should take their cue from an infatuated officialism instead of drawing their own independent inferences from the open facts. (Hear, hear.) But as the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church, so the vituperation of officialism and the lackeys of officialism contributed to the impulse of the Congress movement. (Loud cheers.) They had good reason to be hopeful for the future. (Hear, hear.) They were gaining support in the Press, both London and provincial, and he looked forward to the time when they would have a Secretary of State and a Governor-General of India who would recognise clearly that it was impossible to govern the Indian Empire without the cordial co-operation of the Indian people, and who would send for the President of the National Congress, and say: "Come, my friend, have we not both the same interests at heart? Are we not both men of affairs? Come, let us reason together." (Loud cheers.)

Dr. Sarat Mullick, in responding, said he agreed when he saw so many promising young men around him that they ought not to look upon the state of their country from a pessimistic point of view, because when they returned to their own land he believed they would be able to do something which, at all events, would make the English people believe that they were not a savage foreign country—to quote the words used on a memorable occasion by Lord George Hamilton. India had a great history. There, centuries ago, was propounded a system of philosophy which had not been surpassed by any other nation, and he hoped the time would come when not only would the President of the Indian National Congress be consulted by the Governor-General, but an Indian himself would hold that high and important position. (Cheers.) That might be a dream on his part; but history showed that many a dreamer had had his dreams fulfilled. (Cheers.) They had in India just passed through a period of trouble almost beyond parallel—trouble which might have been expected to produce disaffection and disturbance. But the tide was turning; a better state of affairs was arising, and if they only worked shoulder to shoulder they would be able to do much for the progress of their country. (Loud cheers.) They had recently been startled by the imprisonment of two gentlemen who had rendered great service to India—an imprisonment opposed to the principle of justice, whether in England or in India. They had been told there was nothing which the British Government and the British people liked better than justice—(A voice: "Not in India")—but he regretted to say that the policy recently adopted in India was much more akin to Russian despotism than to British justice. The "forward" policy of aggression beyond the frontier had been well likened by Mr. Morley to the five stages of the Rake's Progress. Had the expense of the "forward" policy been borne by the British people, then there might have possibly been some defence to be found for it. But India alone had to bear the burden. She felt the pinch, and yet her people had no voice in the matter. Mr. A. O. Hume—(cheers)—to whom they would be for ever indebted for his services on behalf of India, writing in regard to the calamitous extravagance which now marked Indian administration, said: "I have grown old and weary in urging on my fellow country-men the inevitable consequences of this wrong-doing; but so surely as there is a divinity who shapes all mortal ends, who requites, slowly it may be but surely, all good and evil doing whether of individuals or nations, so surely shall poor England in some darkest hour of danger and distress have meted to her full retribution for all the wrongs done and now doing in her name to the people of India—a people the most loveable in the world, who need only fair play, justice and kindly trust to figure a generation hence as the premier bulwark of the Empire of which, if our present policy is persisted in, they *must* some day become the subverters." This was the lesson which must be brought plainly before the British public. He hoped it would be found that the Government had sown its wild oats and that it had grown wiser. For if it chose it could achieve an immortal triumph—(hear, hear)—posterity would have cause to bless it, and history would record with praise its truth, justice, and beneficence, for peace and plenty would be the result. (Loud cheering.)

Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, who also responded, said there were two parties in India—one which thought India could only be held by repressing the legitimate aspirations of her people and by excluding them from all share in the administration of their affairs, while the other party, composed of educated Indians and a few true-hearted Englishmen, held that good government and good administration were impossible unless the people were allowed a fair share in the management of their own affairs. Recent events had proved that good administration in India was impossible except with the cordial co-operation of the people, and it was through the lack of such co-operation that the Government in spite of its good intentions had failed in nearly every department. What for instance had been the policy pursued in regard to railways? Lines had been laid down without first ascertaining whether they were needed by the districts through which they passed, and yet the people had to pay interest on the invested capital and had no control over the management. ("Shame.") It was said more lines were to be constructed; but would the people be able to bear these growing financial burdens? Still they might be hopeful for the future. Never was there a time when the wishes and feelings of the people were more stoutly represented than they now were in the Bengal Legislative Council, and he hoped that soon in all these Councils Indians would be able to bring forward their own opinions on matters in which they were directly concerned as were all other classes of British subjects. He hoped the Government would drop the Calcutta Municipal Bill, which if passed would deal a death blow to the system of self-government introduced into Calcutta twenty-two years ago. (Cheers.)

Mr. Gordon Hewart proposed "The London Indian Society."

Mr. H. S. Khalil, in replying, said the Society which had been established for many years, and which had none but patriotic aims and objects, afforded the majority of its members who were in this country preparing themselves for the various professions they intended to follow in India, instruction on social and political subjects connected with India; and it also gave them an opportunity of doing good service for their country by bringing before the British public questions on which they wished to enlist the sympathy of the people. Let them work shoulder to shoulder, for they had on their side the good wishes of the fair-minded British people. Unfortunately at the present moment despotism was reigning in India and it was therefore their duty to continue to uphold the banner of justice and humanity; and truth would in due time vindicate itself and prove the sublimity of their cause. (Cheers).

Mr. Tyabji proposed "The Land we Live in," declaring that it was not the Indians who were disloyal; the disloyalty was on the part of those rulers who failed to carry into practice her Majesty's Gracious Proclamation. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Pickersgill, M.P., who was loudly cheered, said that India had a strange fascination for him, as indeed it should have for all Englishmen, seeing that the two countries were bound together by so many ties. Philologists told them that centuries ago their forefathers dwelt together in Central Asia, and that the two races had in common those words of the family life—father, mother, sister, and brother. There were much nearer and more recent ties. It did seem strange that Englishmen did not take more interest in India. Some superior persons in this country who set themselves up to enlighten

their fellow countrymen in regard to India invariably asserted that India was not a homogeneous country like England, but was a collection of nations differing in blood, in religion, and in language, who but for the overpowering *Pax Britannica* would ever be rushing at one another's throats and would be involved in inextricable confusion. That was continually dinned into their ears, and it was high time that something was said on the other side of the question. It was the case that India was split up into different peoples; but nevertheless it was in the truest sense a homogeneous nation and was separated as completely from the surrounding countries in material and moral features as it was by the mountains and the sea. One of the greatest mistakes that Englishmen made was to suppose that what was good for England was necessarily good for India. Burke had pointed out that India, which required such delicate handling, had been most roughly dealt with even by reformers. They must bring Indians and Englishmen more closely together—(hear, hear)—for the more they learned one about the other the more they might cherish the hope that as years rolled by they would become united in the bonds not only of interest but also of affection. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Martin Wood also replied, dwelling especially on the prospects of the Native States of India. He also advised his hearers to make a study of the works of Major Evans-Bell.

Mr. Paranjpe gave "Our Guests," in an eloquent speech, in which he spoke in eulogistic terms of the work done for them by the various gentlemen their Society was entertaining that evening.

Mr. W. A. Chambers said that one of the most pleasant recollections he would carry back to India would be the pleasure he had experienced in dining on the eve of his departure from England with the liveliest set of young fellows he had met, led by the heartiest old man he had ever known—(cheers and laughter)—and he was sure that when he retailed that experience to his friends in Madras two months hence they would not only hear him with the greatest pleasure, but would look forward to the time when these young men would bring some of their liveliness back to India (Hear, hear.) Now he was an Anglo-Indian who while he lived in India still desired to be a British citizen, and who wished to see all the subjects of her Majesty enjoying the same privileges. He did not know any Indians who did not deserve such privileges. (Hear, hear.) It had been his lot to go on many occasions into the plague hospitals of Bombay. On entering, whom had he seen first? They had heard much of the work of Englishmen with all the initials of the alphabet at the end of their names, but his experience had been that the first person he met in a hospital had been an Indian gentleman or Indian doctor, and he wished to testify to the fact that the plague organisation in Bombay had been carried on mainly if not wholly by Indian doctors whose names were seldom brought to the notice of the public. Some had had unfortunately to lay down their lives in the service of the people, and he knew a Native municipal administrator who was torn to pieces by an infuriated mob while serving the cause of his country. Undoubtedly many educated Indians had died at the post of duty, and he hoped that the next time they read eulogies of an English doctor for his work in a plague hospital they would remember that many of their own countrymen, whose names were not recorded, had equally well done their duty. (Cheers.) As to the position of affairs in India generally, he was glad to believe that a spirit of reaction against the present policy of the Government was setting in all over this country. (Hear, hear.) He had had the privilege of addressing many meetings and had been much gratified with the support he had received, support which he believed would have due weight at the next General Election. They need not be despondent. A better time was in store for them. Let them not abate their enthusiasm, but let them carry it back with them to India when their studies in England were completed. (Cheers.)

Mr. Vakil proposed "The President," to whose inestimable services to India he paid eloquent tribute.

Mr. Ghose also addressed the meeting and spoke of the increasing tendency to deal with India in English fiction.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who was enthusiastically cheered, said it was acknowledged that their greatest difficulty arose from the ignorance of the English people on Indian subjects, and it was therefore the duty of their Society and of kindred organisations to educate the public in regard to the true condition of India. Some of their English friends were ridiculed as faddists and philanthropists. But they were of the class which had raised the fame of England to its present height. Progress made in India in the future would be for the good of the world, and as they believed with confidence in the conscience of the British people, let them go on hopefully trying to do their best to enlighten the public of Great Britain so as to hasten the arrival of that day when Englishmen and Indians would enjoy like privileges, and when all alike would be true fellow-citizens. (Cheers.)

LORD CURZON ON INDIA.

The Eton dinner to the Earl of Minto (Governor-General-Designate of Canada), Lord Curzon of Kedleston (Viceroy-Designate of India), and the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon (Bishop-Designate of Calcutta), took place on Friday last at the Café Monico.

Lord Rosebery, who presided, proposed the toast of "Our Guests." In the course of his speech he said:—

Lastly, I take the case of our friend who is going to undertake the highest post of the three, because after all it is one of the highest posts that any human being can occupy. He goes to it in the full flower of youth, and of manhood, and of success—a combination to which everyone must wish well. Lord Curzon has this additional advantage in his favour—that he is reviving a dormant class, the Irish peerage. (Laughter and cheers.) Some might think that that implied some new legislative or constitutional development on the part of her Majesty's Government, but it would be out of my place to surmise that to be the case. But at any rate sure I am of this—that Lord Curzon of Kedleston has shown in his position at the Foreign Office qualities of eloquence, of debating power, of argument, which have hardly been surpassed in the career of any man of his standing. (Hear, hear.) I cannot say—it would be difficult to say—that he has done so in defence of difficult positions, because that would be at once to raise a political issue of the very gravest kind. (Laughter.) But I am quite sure that no Under-Secretary has ever had to defend in the House of Commons any but positions of difficulty, and I think the foreign situations are always of that character. I am quite sure that when Lord Curzon has had to defend these situations he has defended them with not less than his customary success. He has devoted special study to India. I believe he has even entered into amicable relations with neighbouring potentates. He will pass from his home of Kedleston in Derbyshire to the exact reproduction of Kedleston in Government House, Calcutta. We all hope that in his time India may enjoy a prosperity which has of late been denied to her, and that immunity from war and famine and pestilence may be the blessed prerogative of Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty. (Cheers.)

Lord Curzon of Kedleston, who was received with loud cheers on rising, said:—

This gathering to-night composed as it is of old schoolfellows, old friends of men who have inherited the same traditions and are loyal to the same collegiate mother, is a compliment which I am sure the happy trio who are fortunate enough to be your guests are never likely to forget. But if there is anything that could enhance the special significance and value of that compliment, it would consist in the fact that Lord Rosebery has consented to occupy the chair and in the speech to which we listened a short time ago. (Cheers.) It will ever be memorable to me, whose public life has been associated with one political party, that at this turning point in my fortunes, my health has been proposed by one who has been the leader of the rival political party. (Cheers.) And it will be memorable to all of us, your guests this evening, that as we are starting forth for our different spheres of work, the farewell to which we have listened should have proceeded from the lips of an ex-Prime Minister of England. (Cheers.) Surely there is something of good omen in this combination. For after all we each of us are going out to occupy, if the expression may be permitted, a different thwart in that craft of Empire of which Lord Rosebery once pulled the stroke oar. (Hear, hear.)

LORD ROSEBERY THE TEACHER OF IMPERIALISM.

From his lips we have all of us on many occasions imbibed the lessons of an Imperialism exalted but not arrogant, fearless but not rash—(cheers)—an Imperialism which is every day becoming less and less the creed of a party and more and more the faith of a nation. (Loud cheers.) I have said that we are especially fortunate in our hosts and in our Chairman. But may I, for myself, also claim a particular good fortune in the person of one of my fellow-guests. When 20 years ago Welldon and I lived together in Paris, in the house of a French apothecary, to study the French language—(laughter)—when at a later date we crossed together the United States of America, and together viewed the glories of Niagara and the Yosemite Valley; when on another occasion, in the company of a very dear friend also present to-night, the headmaster of Haileybury, we rode together across the mountains and valleys of Greece, little did we think that the day would one day come when at the same time he and I should be going forth to the same great continent to take our share in that noble work which I firmly believe has been placed by the inscrutable decrees of Providence upon the shoulders of the British race. (Cheers.) I congratulate India upon having obtained such a successor to the See of Heber and of Cotton. (Cheers.) I congratulate myself that I shall have as my spiritual and episcopal master one of my oldest and dearest of friends. Lord Rosebery has spoken in gracious terms of the circumstances under which I have accepted this appointment. There is a passage in the writings of Thomas Carlyle which in this connexion has always haunted my mind. This is what that acute but rugged old philosopher said:—

"I have sometimes thought what a thing it would be could the Queen in Council pick out some gallant-minded, stout cadet and say to him, 'Young fellow, if there do lie in you potentialities of governing, of gradually guiding, leading and coercing to a noble goal, how sad it is they should be all lost. See, I have scores on scores of colonies. One of these you shall have as vice-king. Go you and buckle with it in the name of Heaven, and let us see what you will build it to.'"

Well, though these words were spoken of the West Indian colonies I think that, *mutatis mutandis*, they are equally applicable to the East Indian Empire, and they indicate to me the spirit of courage, but yet of humility, of high aspiration, but still more of duty, in which any man should approach such a task. (Hear.) I have often seen during the past few weeks my acceptance of this office attributed to a variety of causes—to personal ambition, to the disappointment of Parliamentary hopes, to failing health. (Laughter.) My own experience of public life, such as it has been, leads me to think that the simplest explanation of the phenomenon of human action, human beings being more or less always cast in the same mould, is apt to be the most correct, and the recondite is often the fallacious as well as the obscure. (Laughter.)

"BECAUSE I LOVE INDIA."

Is it permissible, therefore, for me to say in this company of old schoolfellows and of personal friends that, whatever may have been the views of those who thought me worthy of this office, I gladly accepted it because I love India, its people, its history, its government, the absorbing mysteries of its civilisation and its life? I think it was first while I was at Eton that a sense of its overwhelming importance dawned upon my mind. There we were perpetually invited by a body of assiduous and capable mentors—I need hardly say I allude to the Eton masters—(laughter)—and we responded with greater or less reluctance to the appeal, to contemplate the majesty, the law, and the living influence of the Empire of Rome. We had at Eton, and I hope it still flourishes, an institution called the Literary

Society, of which, I believe, my friend Welldon was the first president, and in which I afterwards had the honour to follow in his footsteps. To this society, from time to time, came down eminent men to preach to us about the wider world outside. Among those distinguished persons who came in my day was Sir James Fitz-James Stephen, but just returned from India—the father of my dear friend, Jim Stephen, the "J. K. S." of the literary world, that brilliant but meteoric intellect that all too soon plunged into the abyss and was lost from view. (Hear, hear.) Sir James Stephen came down to Eton and told the boys that listened to him, of whom I was one, that there was in that ancient continent an empire more populous, more amazing, and more beneficent than that of Rome; that the rulers of that great dominion were drawn from the men of our own people; that some of them might perhaps in the future be drawn from the ranks of the boys who were listening to his words. Ever since that day, and still more since my first visit to India in 1887, the fascination, and, if I may say so, the sacredness of India has grown upon me until I have come to think that it is the highest honour that can be placed upon any subject of the Queen that in any capacity, high or low, he should devote such energies as he may possess to its services. (Cheers.)

THE IDEAL OF DUTY.

But may I carry my suggestion one step further? May I not say that the growth of the ideal of duty has been the most salient feature in the history of our relations with India during the past hundred years and still more during the reign of the present Queen? (Cheers.) A century ago India in the hands of the East India Company was regarded as a mercantile investment, the business of whose promoters and agents was to return as large dividends as possible, and the larger, of course, the better, to the pockets of their shareholders at home. In the course of these proceedings many of those men amassed great wealth almost beyond the dreams of avarice—wealth, the display of which was apt to be vulgar and the source of which was often impure. Indian posts, low as well as high, were the spoils of political patronage at home, and were exclusively distributed according to the narrowest and most selfish exigencies of party polemics at home. We have only to look to the treatment of Warren Hastings to realise how little the welfare of India was thought of in comparison with the loss or gain to Whigs and Tories in London. I do not say that we have altogether extricated India from the perils and the contamination of the party system. I do not say that our administration of that great empire is altogether free from blemish or taint. But I do say that it is informed with a spirit of duty, and that it is edified and elevated by that influence. I do say that we think much of the welfare of India and but little of its wealth—(hear, hear)—that we endeavour to administer the government of that country in the interests of the governed; that our mission there is one of obligation and not of profit, and that we do our humble best to retain by justice that which we may have won by the sword. (Cheers.) May we not, indeed, say that at the end of the 19th century the spectacle presented by our dominion in India is that of British power sustained by a Christian ideal? (Cheers.) What then is the conception of his duty that an outgoing Viceroy should set before himself? I have no new or startling definition to give, but the light in which it presents itself to my mind is this. It is his duty, first and foremost, to represent the authority of the Queen-Empress, whose name, revered more than the name of any other living Sovereign by all races and classes, from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas, is in India both a bond of union and a symbol of power, and associated with the personal attributes that cling about that name, the conviction that the justice of her government is inflexible, that its honour is stainless, and that its mercy is in proportion to its strength. (Cheers.) Secondly, he should try to remember that all its people are not the sons of our own race, and that it is only by regard for their feelings, by respect for their prejudices—I will even go so far as to say by deference to their scruples—that we can obtain the acquiescence as well as the submission of the governed. (Cheers) Thirdly, it is to recognise that, though relatively far advanced in the scale of civilisation compared with the time of Lord Wellesley or even Lord Canning, India is still but ill-equipped with the material and industrial and educational resources which are so necessary to her career and so to work that she may, by slow but sure degrees, expand to the full measure of her growth. And lastly, it is to preserve intact and secure either from internal convulsion or external inroad, the boundaries of that great and Imperial dominion. (Loud cheers.)

"I HAVE MANY THINGS TO UNLEARN."

This I would venture to suggest is the conception which every outgoing Viceroy sets before himself. He is probably unwise if he attempts to fill in the details too closely in advance. The experience in which he must be sadly lacking at the start, but which will come to him in increasing volume day by day, will with slow and sometimes with painful touch fill in the details as he proceeds. For after all—and I speak to those, if there are any here present, who have travelled in the East and have caught the fascination of its mysterious surroundings—the East is a University in which the scholar never takes his degrees. (Hear, hear.) It is the temple in which the suppliant adores but never catches sight of the object of his devotion; it is a journey the goal of which is always in sight but is never attained. There we are always learners, always worshippers, always pilgrims. I rejoice to be allowed to take my place in that great band of students and of wayfarers who have trodden that path for a hundred years. I know I have everything to learn. I have perhaps many things to unlearn. But if the test of the pupil be application, and if the test of the worshipper be faith, I hope I may pass through the ordeal unscathed. (Cheers.) At any rate, I have among the long list of names inscribed on the back of this *menu* the example of three immediate Eton predecessors to guide me—of Lord Dufferin—(cheers)—whose Indian Viceroyalty was but the culminating point in a career which for over 30 years has been the property less of himself than of his country—(cheers)—of Lord Lansdowne—(cheers)—who left India amid greater manifestations of popularity and of regard and esteem than any departing Viceroy since the Mutiny—(cheers)—and of my immediate predecessor, Lord Elgin—(cheers)—who has confronted a time of storm and stress with a fortitude and a composure which are worthy of the high name he bears and of the race from which he is sprung. (Cheers.) I know that with these distinguished predecessors I cannot hope to compete. But there is one characteristic which I share in common with them and which we possess from our common part in the Eton heritage, and that is the desire to be true to the honour and the credit of that ancient foundation. (Cheers.) I am not so foolish to-night as to utter any vain prophecies or to indulge in any illusive hopes. But I should be satisfied if I can carry out the work which they have begun and if at the end of my time it can be said of me that I have not been unworthy of the traditions of the greatest and the noblest of schools. (Loud cheers.)

THE KHYBER "SETTLEMENT."

The following Reuter's telegram, dated Peshawar, October 27, appeared in the newspapers of Friday last, October 28:—

General Egerton and Commissioner Cunningham, assisted by Mr. Donald, Political Officer in the Khyber, again had an interview to-day with the Afridi Jirgahs. The object of the meeting was not to receive the reply to the Government terms, but simply to give the Jirgahs an opportunity to hand in all the petitions which they wished to make.

A large number were presented, including several from individual and tribal sub-sections, asking humbly for the release of convicted Afridi criminals, the pardon of offenders who had absconded, and also, in some cases, compensation for damages done to houses and property.

The following seven petitions were put forward by the entire Afridi Jirgah: (1) The reduction of the salt duty. (2) The restoration of fugitive wives. (3) Permission for Saruarchan of Hangu to return to his home. (4) The recall of the Khyber Maliks from Kabul. (5) The payment of the subsidy from the date on which they complied with the original demands of the Government by paying the fine imposed and giving up the rifles demanded. (6) The appointment of Afridi Native officers in the new Khyber Militia; and (7) Compensation for damage done to the mills at Ali Musjid and the villagers in the Khyber.

The petitions are couched in the humblest terms, and the attitude of the Jirgahs is respectful and submissive. The clansmen have practically accepted the terms announced on the 24th inst., but have decided to wait for the Kambar Khel before giving their final answer.

A signed article by Colonel H. B. Hanna upon the proposed new arrangements in the Khyber Pass will be found on another page. It may be interesting to reproduce here a letter from Col. Hanna to the editor of the *Broad Arrow*, which appeared in that periodical on October 22:—

Sir,—With reference to the remarks contained in your Comments of the 15th inst., that the route to India by the Kabul Valley "presents no practically insuperable difficulties," and that "our North-West Frontier has to be made secure, and the battle fought beyond it, and this seems to be the one opinion to which in the long run all disputants come," pardon me if I point out that your views are not supported by either Lord Roberts, or that eminent strategist, the late Sir Edward Hamley.

Lord Roberts, in his elaborate memorandum dated Kabul, May 29, 1880, deprecated our holding any position in, or beyond, the Khyber Pass:

> We are now (he wrote) also fully aware of the extraordinary difficulties which Russia would have to encounter were she at any time to advance upon India *viâ* Kabul, and to how great an extent we could injure and harass her by raising the tribes along the line of communications which it would be necessary for her to maintain, or by taking the initiative from our advanced, yet secure, base at Kandahar. The longer and more difficult the line of communication is, the more numerous and greater the obstacles which Russia would have to overcome, and, so far from shortening one mile of the road, I would let the web of difficulties extend to the very mouth of the Khyber Pass.

Sir Edward Hamley was, if possible, more strongly opposed to any such measure. Lecturing in 1878 at the Royal United Service Institution, on "The Strategical Condition of India's North-West Frontier," he declared that:

> There is much to be said against, nothing for, the occupation of a post beyond the Khyber, and that it would be a source not of strength but of weakness. In saying what I think should not be done, I am prepared to say what I think should be done on this side; and it is satisfactory to me to think that the alternative plan, while, in my opinion, the best in the military sense, involves no extension of territory, no expenditure worth mentioning, and no increase of frontier force. It consists, first, in blocking the mouths of the Khyber on our side of it with an entrenched camp armed with powerful artillery, to be garrisoned by the Peshawar troops, reinforced in case of need. If this were suitably occupied, I cannot conceive how an enemy's force, however superior, advancing, as it must of necessity, in lengthened, even straggling, array to the mouth of the Khyber, could expect ever to issue from it.

Strong however as India's natural defences are, the question really is, as the Duke of Wellington pointed out more than half-a-century ago, "One of commissariat, and that of commissariat one of transport," an opinion which the conditions of mountain

warfare on this frontier has shown, time after time, to be incontrovertible. Should any of your readers doubt it let them study Colonel Hutchinson's admirable account of the recent Tirah Campaign, a short extract from which, with your permission, I will give below:

> There are now assembled on this ground (the Khanki Valley) 6,800 British ranks, 10,200 Native ranks, 17,000 followers, and upwards of 25,000 animals! The daily requirements of this multitude in the way of food alone (and they have other needs) amount to 3,000 maunds (more than 107 tons) weight of stuff at a moderate estimate. But the road from our base at Shinauri is at present so long and winding, and narrow and steep, and so crowded with troops and traffic, that supplies can only be very gradually brought up and are consumed here almost as soon as they arrive; while to crown our difficulties it is almost impossible to send back to Shinauri the unladen transport animals, because of the narrowness of the track, on which two mules can hardly pass each other except at a few points.

If then Sir William Lockhart had such difficulties to contend against in moving and feeding 17,000 troops, only a few miles from his base, would not the operation of moving and maintaining a Russian army of 150,000 men, 150,000 followers, and a quarter-of-a-million animals, in its passage over the long succession of formidable passes, and through the narrow defiles which separate Kabul from Peshawar, be insuperable?

I am, etc.,

Ashcroft, Petersfield, Oct. 18. H. B. HANNA, Colonel.

INDIA IN THE BRITISH PRESS.

THE "PRESS COMMITTEES."

We are glad to see that INDIA has printed a verbatim report of the speeches made at the Westminster Town Hall on October 26. The most striking was that of Mr. W. A. Chambers, the editor of the *Bombay Champion*, whose account of the way in which the Sedition Laws are being worked sounds incredible to home-staying Englishmen. The Sedition Laws were passed, it will be remembered, in consequence of the plague riots, and in a time of great tension, not to say panic. They place the life and liberty of every Native reformer in India at the mercy of the Courts. But their chief use at present seems to be against the Native Press, which is being watched—to use a mild word—by a number of "Press Committees," founded in many important towns, to keep the Indian Press in check.

Take one instance. A Native paper suggested that justice in India was quicker to punish a wrong against an Englishman than against a Native—which seems to be perfectly true. The editor received immediately a letter from the chairman of one of these Press Committees to the following effect:—

> The editor is warned that his article on the conviction of a soldier and the partiality of the Bombay High Court where Europeans are concerned was conceived in bad taste, and that its tone is objectionable.

This was signed by the district magistrate. We give another of these instances in Mr. Chambers's own words:—

> We had had in Bombay a case in which a soldier shot a Native with a Lee-Metford rifle, and the editor, in commenting upon this, said it was unfortunate that the attention of the Government did not seem to be directed towards these occurrences, which were happening too often. He was called before an official and was asked if he was aware that the Government of India knew of this incident, and were about to publish a resolution dealing with these scandals. If he was not aware, why did he not ask before he made such an allegation in his newspaper?

An enquiry which seems to us to show the calibre of the men into whose hands these great powers are placed.

Or let us turn to the case of the Natu brothers. These men are still imprisoned, though another man has been hanged for the crime of which they were accused. It will be remembered that the Natu brothers were arrested, without any reason given, after the murders of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst. They were kept in prison without trial "on administrative order." Then came the confession and execution of the fanatic who really murdered the unfortunate Englishmen. Everyone expected that the Natus would be released, but nothing was done beyond a slight relaxation in their treatment, and nothing has been done yet. No one knows why they are in prison. Lord George Hamilton made some suggestion about a quarrel with a midwife, but that charge does not seem to be endorsed by the Indian authorities. And yet this injustice is still perpetrated in India, while we hold up hands of pharisaic horror at our neighbours, and chant our thanks that we are not as they.—*The Daily Chronicle.*

"THE OUTLOOK IN INDIA."

If our Indian Empire is to be kept in hand, there must be more knowledge of the facts diffused among the people at home, and a clearer apprehension of the meaning of the facts. Thus, in the *North American Review*, Mr. Andrew Carnegie delivers the alarmist judgment that "it is only a matter of time when India, the so-called gem of the British Crown, is to glitter red again." This is a very natural, yet quite mistaken view; it proceeds on the supposition that mischievous causes, though dissimilar in nature and in circumstances, are to issue in the same result. There is no possible material for another Mutiny at the present time; and there will be no redness of mutiny. Yet the mischievous causes which Mr. Carnegie sees must, if not removed, find some outlet of a very disagreeable character; and, if this were all that Mr. Carnegie means, we should be fully in agreement with him. Our lively contemporary, the *Outlook*, scouts Mr. Carnegie's opinion, and goes confidently to sleep over a lot of statistics showing the extent of local self-government in India. "The British Raj," it says, "is now broad-based upon the people's will"—an astounding assertion, which only shows that the writer is readily misled by a mere poetical expression, and has no grip whatever of the practical significance of his facts. It is quite true, as he goes on to say, that "England rules India increasingly through India"; or rather, it was true up to a recent date. The *Outlook* has apparently not done us the honour of reading what we have said about the Mackenzie Bill, now before the Bengal Legislative Council, nor has it taken notice of the Government interference with the municipal affairs of Poona. If it cannot follow the political movements of India in the Indian newspapers, it might at least keep its eye upon the treatment of Indian questions by INDIA, and by some of its other contemporaries in neighbouring streets of London. Admitting all the *Outlook's* statistics, the fact yet remains plain, that this new-fangled Bill for Calcutta signifies the suppression of local self-government in the very capital of the Indian Empire. It reduces the elective commissioners to powerless insignificance, and places all effective authority in the hands of Government nominees or other foreigners. The city of Calcutta has been convulsed with indignant opposition; meetings to protest have been held in all the wards, and an immense public meeting in the town hall has petitioned the Lieutenant-Governor in a reasoned protest against the Bill. Yet the Bill will go through. Again, in Poona, a Government resolution has reduced the elective members of the municipality to a nonentity, by increasing the nominated members from ten to eighteen. There seems little hope, indeed, that the crusade against municipal government will stop short with Calcutta and Poona. Where, then, is the use of pointing to municipal government as showing that "the British Raj is broad-based upon the people's will"? The people's will, in fact, is about as powerless as the *Outlook* itself. And, in any case, even assuming that the local self-government system were perfect, how could that ward off the dangers arising from perpetual adventures beyond the frontier, emptying the treasury and impoverishing the country? The Viceroy's attention is steadily diverted from internal affairs, and he cannot possibly see to them with his own eyes and mind. He is dependent on his subordinates. These subordinates are in their turn dependent on lower subordinates. The lower subordinates now work under a system that prevents them from knowing personally the thoughts and feelings of the people. The result is, necessarily, that the Government action is determined by preconceptions and by fancies totally alien to the actual state of things. However good the intentions of the British officials, government in any rational sense in the interests of the people is quite impracticable.—*The New Age.*

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On Tuesday, October 25, a lecture was given on behalf of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress to the members of the Literary Society, Union Chapel, Manchester, on "The industrial condition of the Indian people." Mr. Elijah Helm, Secretary of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, was announced to preside, but as he was prevented at the last moment from attending the Rev. F. Roberts took his place. There was a large audience and many gentlemen took part in the discussion. A hearty vote of thanks was accorded to the lecturer for the information on Indian questions given to the Society.

On Thursday, October 27, a public meeting was held at the Liberal Hall, Heywood, to hear an address by a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee on "Can Russia invade India?" Mr. Dutson presided over a good attendance. The lecturer pointed out how much it was to the interest of Lancashire people that India should be prosperous, and that the taxpayer's money should be spent in developing the resources of India, and not flung away on extending the frontier, and making costly military railways. A discussion followed in which all the speakers urged more generous treatment of India by England.

Meetings have been arranged for next week as follows:—

Nov. 6. Manchester Labour Church.

„ 10. Blackpool Liberal Association.

JUST PUBLISHED.

With Maps, Plans, Portraits, and Illustrations, 8vo, 8/6 net.

THE CAMPAIGN IN TIRAH
1897-98.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE EXPEDITION AGAINST THE ORAKZAIS AND AFRIDIS UNDER GENERAL SIR WILLIAM LOCKHART, G.C.B., K.C.S.I.

Based (by permission) on Letters contributed to the TIMES,

By COLONEL H. D. HUTCHINSON,
Director of Military Education in India.

DAILY CHRONICLE.—"We are not sure that his very carefully compiled and very well written work will not ultimately rank as the best account of this our finest instance of mountain warfare. . . . . Must be a real pleasure to all students of military history."

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 pp.

Published by the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

6d. Weekly.]

THE
"HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE
SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & Co.

OFFICES: 56, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

TRADE MARK

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 2nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.